<center>REMARKS</center>

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 5 and 17 were previously canceled. Hence, claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 5, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

I.   ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS — 35 U.S.C. § 102(e): PFITZNER

Claims 1, 6-11, 13, 18-23 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 ("Pfitzner"). (Office Action, page 2) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

<center>CLAIM 1</center>

Current Claim 1 recites:

1.   A method of providing access to services across a computer network, comprising the step of:
generating an authentication, authorization and access request by a requesting network access device through which, upon a successful authentication and authorization of an end user device to the computer network, the end user device can obtain access to network resources, said authentication, authorization and access request comprising a requesting network access device description and a plurality of service requests indicative of computer services for which the requesting network access device requests provisioning;
wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version; and
forwarding, to an authentication, authorization and access-control server, said authentication, authorization and access request for authentication and authorization of the end user device to the computer network.

Support for the amendment is provided at least in paragraphs [17]-[26], [29]-[33] and FIG. 1 of the applicants' specification.

Claim 1 recites an "authentication, authorization and access request," which is known as a term of art. It describes a request sent to an authentication, authorization and accounting (AAA) server by a network access server (NAS) on behalf of an end-user.

As recited in Claim 1, an authentication, authorization and access request comprises a plurality of service requests indicative of computer services for which the requesting NAS requests provisioning on behalf of the end-user. The request allows the end-user device to request and obtain access to services and resources available in a computer network. As depicted in applicants' FIG. 1, an end-user is connected to a NAS and uses the NAS as a point of access to a computer network. The authentication, authorization and access request is sent by the NAS on behalf of the end-user to negotiate for the end-user access to the network resources. The NAS connects the end-user with the network. The NAS forwards the authentication, authorization and access request to AAA server, as recited in Claim 1.

The AAA request may comprise end user credentials such as, for example, a username, password, security certificate, etc. However, as described in paragraph [4] of the applicants' specification, conventional methods for requesting access to network resources allow sending the user's credentials and a description of **requested** resources, but do not allow a NAS to describe itself to an AAA server. For example, in conventional systems, the NAS could not indicate to an AAA server whether the NAS is a router, WLAN AP, Ethernet switch, VPN concentrator, firewall, etc. Furthermore, in a conventional system the NAS cannot indicate to the AAA server information about the NAS vendor, NAS type, NAS Operating System version, NAS physical location, etc. These shortcomings are overcome in the method recited in Claim 1.

According to Claim 1, in addition to a plurality of service requests indicative of computer services for which the requesting network access device requests provisioning, the AAA request comprises **a requesting network access device description**." The requesting network access device description includes one or more of a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version. Therefore, when the AAA request is forwarded to an AAA server, the AAA server is provided not only with the credentials and service requests, but also the description of the requesting network access device vendor, type and version.

As described in paragraph [26] of the applicants' specification, the approach of Claim 1 is beneficial in managing network because it "provides a way for the AAA server to choose among multiple services that are offered by a single network device," and "authentication and authorization can be provided in a more granular manner (by service/user)" than provided otherwise.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Claim 1 is not anticipated by Pfitzner because Claim 1 recites one or more features as shown in bold that are not described in Pfitzner. For example, Pfitzner does not anticipate "generating an authentication, authorization and access request by a requesting network access device through which, upon a successful authentication and authorization of an end user device to the computer network, the end user device can obtain access to network resources, said authentication, authorization and access request **comprising a requesting network access device description and a plurality of service requests** indicative of computer services for which the requesting network access device requests provisioning," as recited in Claim 1.

Pfitzner describes requests for access to documents and websites, not "authentication, authorization and access requests ... through which, upon a successful authentication and authorization... an end user device can obtain access to network resources," as claimed. Pfitzner describes a system where end-users can send meeting requests (Pfitzner: Col. 10, ll. 64-67), requests to access a meeting (Pfitzner: Col. 11, ll. 4-7), and requests to access documents stored on servers (Pfitzner: Col. 6, ll. 41-43). The meeting requests contain URLs with details about the meeting (Pfitzner: Col. 10, ll. 15, 24-25) and document requests contain URLs of documents (Pfitzner: Col. 5, ll. 18-23). However, Pfitzner's requests are not AAA that are sent to authenticate and authorize users and do not identify an access server or other intermediary. Instead, Pfitzner assumes that the users are already successfully authorized and authenticated, so no AAA request is needed. Pfitzner does not describe authentication in any form, such as

verifying a user's credentials, passwords, or certificates. Hence, Pfitzner's approach is unrelated to the approach recited in Claim 1.

Further, in Pfitzner, only characteristics of a user's device are sent to a server. There is no communication of the characteristics of an access server or other intermediary through which the end user device can obtain access to network resource, as claimed. Any access request that might exist in Pfitzner does not comprise the claimed "requesting network access device description."

Pfitzner also does not anticipate "wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type, a requesting network device version," as recited in Claim 1. In Pfitzner, along with a request, the user sends computing environment information that includes characteristics and capabilities of the user's device, such as size or type of a display of the user's device. (Pfitzner: Col. 7, ll. 16-22) However, Pfitzner does not disclose a requesting network access device through which the end user device can obtain access to network resources, as claimed. Therefore, Pfitzner's description of the characteristics of the user's device cannot correspond to the claimed requesting network access device description of Claim 1.

Therefore, Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not anticipated by Pfitzner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Pfitzner for the same reasons as for Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 24-30

Claims 24-30 recite features similar to those in Claims 11, 13 and 23 or depend on Claims 11, 13 and 23, except that they are directed to a computer–readable storage medium. Therefore, Claims 24-30 are patentable over Pfitzner for the same reasons as for Claims 11, 13 and 23.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS — 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, ANDERSON

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 ("Pfitzner") in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,089,316 ("Anderson"). (Office Action, page 8) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 depend from Claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively. As discussed above, Claim 1 (11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively) recites at least one feature that is not disclosed in Pfitzner. Further, Anderson does not cure the deficiencies of Pfitzner with respect to Claim 1(11, 13, 19 and 23) because Anderson does not anticipate "generating an access request by a requesting network access device, through which an end user device can obtain access to network resources, and which is forwarded for authentication and authorization, wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version," as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action accepted applicants' arguments, submitted by the applicants in the previous reply, that Anderson does not anticipate the "generating [...]," by withdrawing 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23 based on Anderson.

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons and additionally due to claim dependency, Pfitzner and Anderson, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to

expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

II.   CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance.   A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 5, 2009   /MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/
                                          Malgorzata A. Kulczycka
                                          Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076